



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,997	02/26/2004	Martin von der Emde	07781.0146-00	5167

7590 03/02/2010
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, GREGORY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3691

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/02/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/785,997

Applicant(s)

EMDE ET AL.

Examiner

GREGORY JOHNSON

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the application filed February 26, 2004.

Claims 1-82 have been examined.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for foreign priority is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

3. **Claims 25, 27, 80 and 81** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because the independent claims are in a form similar to that of a multiple dependent claim. Independent claims must be in a form which allows the claim to stand-alone (i.e. the claim should not refer to other claims. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 9, 12-13, 36, 39-40, 56, 65, 68, 70 and 72-79** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 9, 12, 36, 39, 56, 65, 68, 70, 72 and 75, the phrase "and/or" is ambiguous and therefore the claims are unclear as to whether the limitations following the phrase are required or that they are to be considered as an option. For examination purposes, the Examiner will interpret "and/or" to mean "or." Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 13, 40, 73-74, and 76-79 are rejected to because of their dependency on either claim 12, 39 or 72.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-24, 28-79 and 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 recites a process comprising the step of enabling; **Claim 53** recites a process comprising the step of providing; and **Claim 72** recites a process comprising the step of accessing. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a proper process must be (1) tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claims, the methods are not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should (1) positively recite (within the body of the claims) the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the *significant* steps of the process or (2) positively recite the *physical* subject matter that is being transformed from one state to another. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-24, 54-71 and 73-79 are rejected based on their dependency on either claim 1, 53 or 72.

Claims 28-52 are rejected to because the claims are directed to a data signal in a carrier wave (as recited in claim 52); this is not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter (see MPEP 2106 – IV. – B.). Appropriate action is required (e.g. canceling claim 52).

Claims 81-82 are rejected to because the claims are directed to a computer program contained in an electrical carrier signal (as recited in claim 82); this is not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter (see MPEP 2106 – IV. – B.). Appropriate action is required (e.g. canceling claim 82).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. **Claims 1-13, 16-19, 24-40, 43-46, 51-53, 56-64, 69-72, 75-76 and 78-82** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heindel et al., Pat. No. 6,304,857 (hereinafter Heindel).

As to claim 1, Heindel teaches a method for processing an electronic document, wherein the document comprises a plurality of data fields and wherein the document is made accessible by a first party to a second party via a computer network, comprising:

enabling a second party to add one or more further data fields to one or more of the data fields of the document (Abstract and col. 2, line 31 thru col. 3, line 9; which discusses a third party billing service center, industry schema tables, and biller customized template).

As to claims 2-13, Heindel teaches the following limitations:

- enabling said second party to enter information into the one or more further data fields (Abstract and col. 2, line 31 thru col. 3, line 9; which discusses industry schema tables and biller customized template);
- providing, by the first party, proposals for the information to the second party according to a predefinable list (Abstract and col. 2, line 31 thru col. 3, line 9; which discusses industry schema tables and biller customized template);
- wherein the document is an electronic bill (Abstract);
- writing, by the first party, financial information into the one or more further data fields and adding the one or more further data fields to the electronic bill (Abstract and col. 2, line 31 thru col. 3, line 9; which discusses service center generating customized billing statements by inserting data and resources into the template at the appropriate fields);
- selecting the financial information from the group consisting of financial objects, accounting objects, and bookkeeping objects (Fig. 2, item 58);
- writing a predefinable value into one or more of the further data fields (col. 4, lines 31-45; via account number);

- wherein enabling said second party to add one or more further data fields to one or more of the data fields of the document comprises providing one or more structured documents (col. 4, line 62 thru col. 5, line 12; col. 6, lines 13-25; and col. 11, lines 10-25; via HTML);
- wherein the structured document comprises data and/or tags and/or program code and wherein the structured document is accessible by the second party (col. 4, line 62 thru col. 5, line 12; col. 6, lines 13-25; and col. 11, lines 10-25; via HTML);
- wherein at least one of the structured documents is a structured table, an XML-file, a HTML-file, or a java server page (col. 4, line 62 thru col. 5, line 12; col. 6, lines 13-25; and col. 11, lines 10-25; via HTML);
- enabling the second party to characterize the bill as accepted or refused (col. 9, lines 13-24; via billing operator approving billing statements);
- sending an accepted electronic bill to the second party and/or to a payment service provider (col. 9, lines 13-24; via billing operator approving billing statements); and
- creating an accounts record from an accepted bill and sending it to the second party (col. 10, lines 23-33, col. 11, lines 27-40, and col. 25, lines 8-20; which discusses records, such as consumer, biller and statement).

As to claims 16-19, Heindel teaches the following limitations:

- naming the one or more further data fields by the first party (col. 6, line 13-65; which discusses various data fields);

- checking an authorization of a user of the second party (col. 24, line 59 thru col. 25, line 1; which discusses validating authorized billers);
- making the document accessible to the second party by means of an intranet or the Internet (Fig. 1); and
- counting the documents and providing an invoice for the processing of the documents to the second party (col. 2, lines 1-54; which discusses contracting with a third party billing service center, such as item 24 in Fig. 1, to handle the electronic bill distribution tasks).

As to claims 24 and 26, Heindel teaches the following limitation:

- wherein the method is for use with an enterprise accounting system (col. 2, lines 42-54; which discusses integrating with a biller's existing billing and accounting systems).

As to claim 25, Heindel teaches a computer system for processing an electronic document, wherein the document comprises a plurality of data fields and wherein the document is made accessible by a first party to a second party via a computer network (Abstract and col. 2, line 31 thru col. 3, line 9; which discusses a third party billing service center, industry schema tables, and biller customized template), comprising:

- memory having program instructions (col. 10, lines 14-67 and Figs. 5-6);
- input means for receiving and entering data (col. 10, lines 14-67 and Figs. 5-6);
- output means for sending and presenting data (col. 10, lines 14-67 and Figs. 5-6);

- storage means for storing data (col. 10, lines 14-67 and Figs. 5-6); and
- a processor responsive to the program instructions (col. 10, lines 14-67 and Figs. 5-6),
- said program instructions comprising program code means for performing a method according to any one of claims 1 to 23 (see the rejection of claims 1-23 above).

As to claim 27, Heindel teaches a computer system for processing an electronic bill, comprising: memory having program instructions; input means for receiving and entering data; output means for sending and presenting data; storage means for storing data; and a processor responsive to the program instructions, wherein a method according to claim 1 is performed to process the electronic bill when said program instructions are executed by said processor (see the rejections for claims 1 and 25 above).

As to claim 28, Heindel teaches a computer readable medium (claim 27) comprising instructions for processing an electronic document, wherein the document comprises a plurality of data fields and wherein the document is made accessible by a first party to a second party via a computer network, said instructions comprising instructions for: enabling a second party to add one or more further data fields to one or more of the data fields of the document (see the rejections for claim 1).

As to claims 29-51, the limitations are substantially equivalent to the limitations of claims 2-24 above, and are therefore rejected on the same grounds.

52. The computer readable medium according to any one of claims 28 to 50, wherein the computer readable medium is a computer data *signal embodied in a carrier wave* (**none patentable subject matter**).

As to claim 53, Heindel teaches a method for processing documents using a computer system, in which the document is available in electronic form with one or more data fields which contain document information, and in which method one or more electronic documents are made accessible to a second party by a first party via a computer network, the method comprising: automatically providing one or more structured documents to the second party, which allows the second party to add one or more further data fields to one or more data fields in the or each electronic document (Abstract and col. 2, line 31 thru col. 3, line 9; which discusses a third party billing service center, industry schema tables, and biller customized template).

As to claim 56, the limitation is substantially equivalent to the combined limitations of claims 2 and 9 above, and is therefore rejected on the same grounds.

As to claim 57, the limitation is substantially equivalent to the limitation of claim 10 above, and is therefore rejected on the same grounds.

As to claims 58-60, Heindel teaches the following limitations:

- wherein the second party uses a web browser to access the or each structured document over a network or the Internet (col. 7, lines 29-38);
- wherein the structured document contains a reference to the storage location of the electronic document (col. 8, lines 59-67, col. 9, lines 56-65, col. 10, lines 34-48 and col. 24, lines 6-21); and

- wherein the or each further data field is preallocated a default value (Abstract; via industry schema tables that provide a default set of predefined billing categories for a given industry).

As to claims 61-64, the limitations are substantially equivalent to the limitations of claims 2, 4, 11 and 12 above, and are therefore rejected on the same grounds.

As to claim 69, the limitation is substantially equivalent to the limitation of claim 12 above, and is therefore rejected on the same grounds.

As to claims 70-71, Heindel teaches the following limitation:

- wherein the information is invoice information and comprises information regarding addresses for the invoice issuer and/or for the invoice receiver and/or for the payment service and/or regarding payment and/or regarding VAT and/or regarding invoice items with respect to the underlying order and/or regarding commentary (col. 10, lines 23-33); and
- wherein the further data fields are provided for inputting account assignment information (col. 10, lines 23-33).

As to claim 72, Heindel teaches a method for processing a electronic document, stored in a computer system of a first party, by a second party, wherein the document comprises a plurality of data fields and wherein the document is made accessible by the first party to the second party via a computer network, the method comprising: accessing one or more structured documents presented by the first party and adding and/or editing one or more further data fields to the electronic document by means of said one or more structured documents (Abstract and col. 2, line 31 thru col. 3, line 9;

which discusses a third party billing service center, industry schema tables, and biller customized template).

As to claims 75-76, the limitations are substantially equivalent to the limitations of claims 9-10 above, and are therefore rejected on the same grounds.

As to claims 78-79, the limitations are substantially equivalent to the limitations of claims 4 and 2 above, respectively, and are therefore rejected on the same grounds.

As to claim 80, Heindel teaches a computer system comprising: memory comprising program instructions; input means for receiving and entering data; output means for sending and presenting data storage means for storing data; and a processor responsive to the program instructions; wherein the program instructions comprise program code means for carrying out a method as claimed according to any one of claims 53 to 69, or 71 to 79 (see the rejections of claims 1, 25, 27, 53, 71 and 79 above).

As to claim 81, Heindel teaches a computer program comprising program code means for executing all the steps in any method as claimed according to any one of claims 1 to 23, 53 to 69, or 71 to 79 when executed on a computer (see the rejections of claims 1, 25, 27, 53, 71 and 79 above).

82. A computer program as claimed in claim 81, wherein the computer program is contained in an *electrical carrier signal* (**none patentable subject matter**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. **Claims 14 and 41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel, in view of Anderson et al., Pub. No. 2003/0208720 (hereinafter Anderson'720).

As to claim 14, Heindel does not explicitly teach wherein two or more of the further data fields are structured hierarchical; however, Anderson'720 teaches the limitation (§10038; via hierarchical structure of segments, fields, parents, and children within intermediate documents (IDocs)).

Heindel teaches methods for processing and the management of electronic documents. And Anderson'720 teaches methods for creating electronic document definitions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as taught by

Anderson'720 within Heindel for the motivation to provide a method for generating electronic document definitions for specifying interfaces to enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems and applications, in which the electronic document definition can be a document type definition (DTD), an extensible markup language (XML) schema, or another markup language document such as a hypertext markup language (HTML) document (¶0009).

As to claim 41, the limitation is substantially equivalent to the limitation of claim 14 above, and is therefore rejected on the same grounds.

12. Claims 15 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel, in view of Anderson et al., Pat. No. 7,379,978 (hereinafter Anderson'978).

As to claim 15, Heindel teaches assigning to one or more of the further data fields a property selected from the group consisting of displayable and non-displayable (col. 6, lines 33-47; via conditional field). Heindel does not teach optionally editable and mandatory editable; however, Anderson'978 teaches these elements (col. 83, line 40 thru col. 84, line 33; which discusses classifying data fields within an electronic document).

Both Heindel and Anderson'978 teach methods for the processing and the management of electronic documents. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include in the electronic billing system as taught by Heindel, the method of classifying data fields as taught by Anderson'978, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it

did separately, and one of ordinary skill in that art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. See MPEP 2143 (Rev. 6, Sept. 2007), Rational (G).

As to claim 42, the limitation is substantially equivalent to the limitation of claim 15 above, and is therefore rejected on the same grounds.

13. Claims 15 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel, in view of Bahl et al., Pub. No. 2002/0038305 (hereinafter Bahl).

As to claim 20, Heindel does not teach the following limitation:

- automatically starting a workflow for processing the bill if an electronic bill is received from a third party.

However, Bahl teaches an automated invoice management method for receiving an invoice from a first client and sending the invoice to a second client. The method includes a session management engine that controls the interface of invoice and remittance transaction files between a server and an unattended interface module or a workstation during the secure session in accordance with workflow scripts (Abstract and ¶0075-0078).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as taught by Bahl within Heindel for the motivation to provide a method for accepting invoices from a plurality of suppliers using a plurality of electronic formats, manage and normalize the invoice data, and to provide the invoices to a customer in an electronic data structure that is compatible with the customers systems for electronic data entry (¶0020).

As to claims 47 and 66, the limitations are substantially equivalent to the limitation of claim 20, and are therefore rejected on the same grounds.

14. Claims 21-22 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel and Bahl as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Ouchi, Pat. No. 5,978,836 (hereinafter Ouchi).

As to claims 21-22 and 48-49, neither Heindel nor Bahl explicitly teach the following limitations; however, Ouchi teaches the limitations:

- sending an electronic notice, which includes a link to the document to an address contained in the workflow (col. 20, lines 30-57; which discusses a form route manager application of a workflow system sending email with URL to users of a workflow); and
- wherein the workflow runs according to a predefinable sequence (col. 2, lines 14-44 and col. 20, lines 30-54; which discusses a form route manager application of a workflow system using a STEP field to determine the next step in the route of a workflow).

Bahl teaches an automated invoice management method for receiving an invoice from a first client and sending the invoice to a second client. The method includes a session management engine that controls the interface of invoice and remittance transaction files between a server and an unattended interface module or a workstation during the secure session in accordance with *workflow scripts*. And Ouchi teaches methods used in workflow systems.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include in the combination of Heindel and Bahl, the workflow method (i.e. steps) as taught by Ouchi, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in that art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. See MPEP 2143 (Rev. 6, Sept. 2007), Rational (G).

15. Claims 23 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel and Bahl as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

As to claims 23 and 50, neither Heindel nor Bahl explicitly teaches the following limitation:

- automatically checking an authorization of a participant of the workflow.

However, Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation within the combination of Heindel and Bahl for the motivation to control who accesses and modifies documents (i.e. protecting confidential/personal data).

At the time of Applicant's invention, it was common practice for computer and web applications to require the use of a login username and password for an individual that has access to consumer account information (e.g. account number, the consumer's name and address, etc).

16. Claims 54-55, 73-74 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel, in view of Ouchi.

As to claims 54 and 55, Heindel does not teach the following limitations; however, Ouchi teaches the limitations:

- wherein a reference to the storage location of the or each structured document is presented to the second party (col. 20, lines 30-57; which discusses a form route manager application of a workflow system sending email with URL to users of a workflow); and
- wherein the second party uses a network connection to access the structured document (col. 2, lines 14-44 and col. 20, lines 30-54; which discusses a user receiving an e-mail with the URL and connecting to a site by selecting the address embedded in the e-mail).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as taught by Ouchi within Heindel for the motivation to provide a method for performing complex database functions using the easy accessibility of e-mail (col. 2, lines 7-11).

As to claims 73-74 and 77, the limitations are substantially equivalent to the limitations of claim 54-55, and are therefore rejected on the same grounds.

17. Claims 65 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel, in view of Pallante, Pub. No. 2003/0028495 (hereinafter Pallante).

As to claims 65 and 68, Heindel does not teach the following limitations; however, Pallante teaches the limitations:

- wherein the electronic document and/or the structured document is encrypted (§§0023 and §0112; via protection of documents in transit and in storage, through data encryption and access control; and proof of sending and receipt, through timestamping, digital signing, and logging); and
- wherein the electronic document and/or the structured document is digitally signed (§§0023 and §0112; via protection of documents in transit and in storage, through data encryption and access control; and proof of sending and receipt, through timestamping, digital signing, and logging).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as taught by Pallante within Heindel for the motivation to provide trusted third party (TTP) services suitable for conveying electronic documents between a plurality of users via a computer network (§0004).

18. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heindel, in view of Upton, Pub. No. 2003/0145047 (hereinafter Upton).

As to claim 67, Heindel does not teach the following limitation;

- wherein the electronic document is automatically checked for presettable criteria.

However, Upton teaches a method for utilizing an interface component to query a document and using a schema to ensure that the document is in the proper format (Abstract and §0075).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as taught by Upton within Heindel for the motivation to provide a method for integrating applicant components using schemas to ensure that information (e.g. documents) passed between the components is in the proper formation (§0020-0021).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGORY JOHNSON whose telephone number is (571)272-2025. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691

GREGORY JOHNSON
Examiner, Art Unit 3691